

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached two sheets of drawings respectively include changes to Figs. 1 and Figs. 7 and 8. These two sheets replace the original two sheets respectively including Figs. 1 and Figs. 7 and 8.

Attachment: Two replacement sheets.

### REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Omunki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,508,517, or Gronek et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,585,351.

The claims have been amended. New claims 12 and 13 have been added. The drawings have been amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

### Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

A supplemental information disclosure statement including Form PTO-1449 is submitted herewith for the Examiner's consideration.

### Amendment to the drawings

Replacement Figs. 1, 7 and 8 are submitted herewith for the Examiner's consideration. Fig. 1 has been amended to include missing reference character 16, discussed in the specification at page 4, line 9. Figs. 7 and 8 have been amended to include reference character 12a, discussed in the specification at page 8, lines 22-23, and to correct reference character 68 to 67, in accordance with the discussion of counterelement 67 in the specification at page 7, line 28. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

### New claims

New claim 12 replaces original claim 1, which has been canceled. New claim 12 clarifies the limitations of claim 1 and adds the limitation that the contamination shielding panel defines an opening configured to pass a microdissected specimen to the at least one receptacle, as discussed in the specification at page 4, line 25, through page 5, line 8. New claim 13 recites a second holding element, as recited in claim 1 and shown in Figs. 1 and 3. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 1

has now been canceled in favor of claim 12, which does not include the “shifting” limitation, but recites that the holding element is displaceable relative to the opening. Claim 7 has now been amended to positively recite a rod, and to depend from claim 2, which positively recites a drawer. Claim 10 has now been amended to recite that the holding element includes a stop and the drawer includes a counterelement configured to limit a movement of the stop so as to limit the pivoting of the first holding element about the axis, as shown in an embodiment at Figs. 7 and 8. It is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is definite, and that claims 7 and 10 are now definite. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Omunki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,508,517, or Gronek et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,585,351.

Omunki et al. describes a scanning probe type microscope apparatus having a cover 14 and an objective lens disposed in an opening of the cover. See Omunki et al. col. 5, lines 31-37, and Fig. 1. Gronek et al. describes an apparatus for inspecting surface mounted components having a shield 48 and, disposed above the shield, chip carriers 12 on an integrated circuit 10 to be inspected. See Gronek et al. col. 3, lines 26-33, and Fig. 3.

New independent claim 12 recites an apparatus for receiving microdissected specimens on an X-Y stage, the apparatus including “a contamination shielding panel defining an opening configured to pass a microdissected specimen to the at least one receptacle”. It is respectfully submitted that neither Omunki et al. nor Gronek et al. teach or suggest this feature of claim 12. In contrast, the cover 14 of Omunki et al. has no opening at all through which a microdissected specimen could be passed to a receptacle. See Omunki et al. Fig. 1. Regarding Gronek et al., the shield 48 has no opening, nor could such an opening in shield 48 pass a microdissected specimen to chip carriers 12, as chip carriers 12 are mounted on integrated circuit 10 disposed above the shield 48. See Gronek et al. Fig. 3. Because both of these references are missing at least the above-recited feature of independent

claim 12, neither Omunki et al. nor Gronek et al. can anticipate claim 12, nor its dependent claims 2-11 and 13.


Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 12 and dependent claims 2-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on each of Omunki et al. and Gronek et al. is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156  
(signing for Erik R. Swanson, Reg. No. 40,833)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940